

Properties of ABA⁺ for Non-Monotonic Reasoning: Errata

Kristijonas Čyras
Imperial College London, UK

Abstract

This technical report provides errata of (Čyras and Toni 2016b) [K. Čyras, F. Toni, Properties of ABA⁺ for Non-Monotonic Reasoning, in: 16th International Workshop on Non-Monotonic Reasoning (NMR), Cape Town, South Africa, 2016 pp. 25–34.] Propositions 19, 20, 22, Corollary 23 and (partially) Proposition 24 from Section 6 (Non-Monotonic Reasoning Properties) in that paper are withdrawn as unproven, and thus assumed to be false, while additional results are provided. The rest of the paper in question stands unchanged.

Non-Monotonic Reasoning Properties

Instead of the Axiom of Contraposition (Čyras and Toni 2016b), we will be using the Axiom of Weak Contraposition (Čyras and Toni 2016a)). The reason for withdrawing some of the results from (Čyras and Toni 2016b, Section 6) is the following: we do not know whether the results in question hold subject to the (stronger) Axiom of Contraposition, because the respective proofs contain several mistakes; we leave the analysis for future work and instead show that, subject to the (weaker) Axiom of Weak Contraposition, several corresponding results are falsified.

Throughout, we assume the following. For a particular semantics $<-\sigma$, where $\sigma \in \{\text{grounded, ideal, stable, preferred, complete}\}$, if it is the case that given an ABA⁺ framework $\mathcal{F}$, for any $<-\sigma$ extension E of $\mathcal{F}$ and for any conclusion $\psi \in \text{Cn}(E)$, the statement expressed in a particular property P holds true, then we say that ‘ $\mathcal{F}$ fulfils P for $<-\sigma$ semantics’.

We first show that ABA⁺ inherits the behaviour from ABA with respect to the non-monotonic inference properties under $<-\text{stable}$ semantics.

Proposition 1. $\mathcal{F}$ fulfils *CREDULOUS STRICT CUT* and *CREDULOUS STRICT MON* for $<-\text{stable}$ semantics.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg, \leq)$ be a flat ABA⁺ framework satisfying the Axiom of Weak Contraposition, let E be a $<-\text{stable}$ extension of $\mathcal{F}$, and let $\psi \in \text{Cn}(E) \setminus \mathcal{A}$. Define $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A}, \neg, \leq)$. Cn and Cn' will denote

the conclusion operators of, respectively, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$. The $<-\text{attack}$ relations of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ will be denoted by $\rightsquigarrow_{<}$ and $\rightsquigarrow'_{<}$, respectively. We claim that E is a $<-\text{stable}$ extension of $\mathcal{F}'$.

Suppose for a contradiction that E is not $<-\text{conflict-free}$ in $\mathcal{F}'$. Then E is not conflict-free in $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A}, \neg)$, by (Čyras and Toni 2016a, Theorem 5). But then, as $\psi \in \text{Cn}(E)$, E is not conflict-free in $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg)$ either. Hence, by (Čyras and Toni 2016a, Theorem 5), E is not $<-\text{conflict-free}$ in $\mathcal{F}$, which is a contradiction. Thus, E is $<-\text{conflict-free}$ in $\mathcal{F}'$.

Now let $\beta \in \mathcal{A} \setminus E$ be arbitrary. We aim to show that $E \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$. To this end, as E is $<-\text{stable}$ in $\mathcal{F}$, we know that $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$. We split into cases.

- Suppose $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack. Then $A \vdash^R \bar{\beta}$, $A \subseteq E$, $R \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and $\forall \alpha \in A \ \alpha \not\prec \beta$. If this deduction does not involve ψ , then clearly we have $A \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack. Else, we can find $A' \subseteq A$ and $R' \subseteq R \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}$ such that $A' \vdash^{R'} \bar{\beta}$, whence clearly $A' \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack too.
- Suppose $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$ via reverse attack. Then $\{\beta\} \vdash \bar{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon \in E$ such that $\beta < \varepsilon$. Since $\beta \notin E$ and E is $<-\text{conflict-free}$, this $<-\text{attack}$ does not involve ψ . Hence, $\{\varepsilon\} \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via reverse attack too.

In any event, $E \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$, as required. Therefore, E is $<-\text{stable}$ in $\mathcal{F}'$. $\square$

Proposition 2. $\mathcal{F}$ fulfils *CREDULOUS ASM CUT* and *CREDULOUS ASM MON* for $<-\text{stable}$ semantics.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg, \leq)$ be a flat ABA⁺ framework satisfying the Axiom of Weak Contraposition, let E be a $<-\text{stable}$ extension of $\mathcal{F}$, and let $\psi \in \text{Cn}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}$. Define $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\psi\}, \neg, \leq')$, where $\leq'$ is a restriction of $\leq$ to $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\psi\}$. Cn and Cn' will denote the conclusion operators of, respectively, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$. The $<-\text{attack}$ relations of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ will be denoted by $\rightsquigarrow_{<}$ and $\rightsquigarrow'_{<}$, respectively. We show that $E \setminus \{\psi\}$ is $<-\text{stable}$ in $\mathcal{F}'$.

Suppose for a contradiction that $E \setminus \{\psi\}$ is not $<-\text{conflict-free}$ in $\mathcal{F}'$. Then $E \setminus \{\psi\}$ is not conflict-free in $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\psi\}, \neg)$, by (Čyras and Toni 2016a, Theorem 5). But then, as $\psi \in \text{Cn}(E)$, E is not conflict-free in $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg)$. Hence, by (Čyras and Toni 2016a, Theorem 5), E is not $<-\text{conflict-free}$ in $\mathcal{F}$, which is a contradiction.

conflict-free in $\mathcal{F}$, which is a contradiction. Thus, $E \setminus \{\psi\}$ must be $<$ -conflict-free in $\mathcal{F}'$.

Now let $\beta \in \mathcal{A} \setminus (E \cup \{\psi\})$ be arbitrary. We aim to show that $E \setminus \{\psi\} \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$. To this end, as E is $<$ -stable in $\mathcal{F}$, we know that $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$.

- Suppose $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack. Then $A \vdash^R \bar{\beta}$, $A \subseteq E$, $R \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and $\forall \alpha \in A \ \alpha \not\prec \beta$. If $\psi \notin A$, then we have $A \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack. Else, we find $A \setminus \{\psi\} \vdash^R \bar{\beta}$, so that $A \setminus \{\psi\} \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via normal attack.
- Suppose $E \rightsquigarrow_{<} \{\beta\}$ via reverse attack. Then $\{\beta\} \vdash \bar{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon \in E$ such that $\beta < \varepsilon$. If $\varepsilon \neq \psi$, then this $<$ -attack does not involve ψ , and so we have $\{\varepsilon\} \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$ via reverse attack, where $\{\varepsilon\} \subseteq E \setminus \{\psi\}$. Else, $\{\beta\} \vdash \bar{\psi}$ and $\beta < \psi$, so the Axiom of Weak Contraposition guarantees that, in $\mathcal{F}$, we have $A \vdash \bar{\beta}$ for some $A \subseteq \{\psi\}$. But then, in $\mathcal{F}'$, we find $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\beta}$.

In any event, $E \setminus \{\psi\} \rightsquigarrow'_{<} \{\beta\}$, as required. Therefore, $E \setminus \{\psi\}$ is $<$ -stable in $\mathcal{F}'$. Finally, note that $Cn(E) = Cn'(E \setminus \{\psi\})$. $\square$

In general, however, ABA^+ does not inherit all the properties from ABA . In particular, CUT and MON can in general be violated in both STRICT and ASM settings under all but $<$ -stable semantics. The following examples illustrate violations.

Example 1 (STRICT MON violation). Consider $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$ with

- $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha, \beta, p, q, \varepsilon, x\}$,
- $\mathcal{R} = \{\psi \leftarrow p, q, \ \bar{\varepsilon} \leftarrow \beta, x, \psi, \ \bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x, p, \ \bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x, p, \ \bar{x} \leftarrow x\}$,
- $\beta < \alpha$.

This flat ABA^+ framework $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the Axiom of Weak Contraposition. It has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E = \{p, q, \alpha, \varepsilon\}$ with $Cn(E) = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi, \varepsilon\}$. Note that $\{\alpha\} <$ -defends $\{\varepsilon\}$ from $\{\beta, x, p, q\}$ by $<$ -attacking the latter via reverse attack, due to the rule $\bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x, p$ and the preference $\beta < \alpha$.

Consider $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\psi \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$. In this framework, $\{\varepsilon\}$ is $<$ -attacked by the self- $<$ -attacking $\{\beta, x\}$, and no subset of E can $<$ -defend $\{\varepsilon\}$ against this $<$ -attack. Indeed, $\mathcal{F}'$ has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E' = \{p, q, \alpha\}$ with $Cn'(E') = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi\} \not\subseteq Cn(E)$. (Here and in further examples, Cn' is the conclusion operator of $\mathcal{F}'$.) Hence, $\mathcal{F}$ does not fulfil STRICT MON under any of the four semantics in question.

Example 2 (ASM MON violation). Consider $\mathcal{F}$ and E from Example 1. Let $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{\alpha \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\alpha\}, \bar{\cdot}, \emptyset)$. In $\mathcal{F}'$, $\{\varepsilon\}$ is $<$ -attacked by the self- $<$ -attacking $\{\beta, x, p, q\}$, and cannot be $<$ -defended by any set not containing x . Overall, $\mathcal{F}'$ has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E' = \{p, q\}$ with $Cn'(E') = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi\} \not\subseteq Cn(E)$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}$ does not fulfil ASM MON under any of the four semantics in question.

Example 3 (ASM CUT violation). Consider $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$ with

- $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha, \beta, p, q, \varepsilon, x\}$,
- $\mathcal{R} = \{\psi \leftarrow p, q, \ \bar{\varepsilon} \leftarrow \beta, x, \psi, \ \bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x, p, \ \bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x, p, \ \bar{x} \leftarrow x, \ \psi \leftarrow \top\}$,
- $\beta < \alpha$.

So $\mathcal{F}$ is simply $\mathcal{F}'$ from Example 1. It satisfies the Axiom of Weak Contraposition and we know that it has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E = \{p, q, \alpha\}$ with $Cn(E) = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{p \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A} \setminus \{p\}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$. In $\mathcal{F}'$, given that p is a fact, the $<$ -attacker $\{\beta, x\}$ of $\{\varepsilon\}$ is $<$ -attacked by $\{\alpha\}$ via reverse attack. Thus, $\{\alpha\} <$ -defends $\{\varepsilon\}$, and so $E' = \{q, \alpha, \varepsilon\}$ with $Cn'(E') = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi, \varepsilon\} \not\subseteq Cn(E)$ is a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension of $\mathcal{F}'$. This shows that $\mathcal{F}$ does not fulfil ASM CUT under any of the four semantics in question.

Example 4 (STRICT CUT violation). Consider $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$ with

- $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha, \beta, p, q, \varepsilon, x\}$,
- $\mathcal{R} = \{\psi \leftarrow p, q, \ \bar{\varepsilon} \leftarrow \beta, x, \psi, \ \bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x, y, \ y \leftarrow p, \ \bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x, p, \ \bar{x} \leftarrow x, \ \bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x, \ \psi \leftarrow \top\}$,
- $\beta < \alpha$.

(So, in contrast to the framework from Example 1, there is an intermediate non-assumption y deducible from $\{p\}$ and replacing p in the rule $\bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x, p$; we also have ψ as a fact, and the rule $\bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x$ will be needed for Weak Contraposition in the framework $\mathcal{F}'$ after the change.)

$\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the Axiom of Weak Contraposition and has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E = \{p, q, \alpha\}$ with $Cn(E) = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi, y\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{y \leftarrow \top\}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot}, \leq)$. (Since in $\mathcal{F}'$ we have the deduction $\{\beta, x\} \vdash \{\bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \beta, x\} \ \bar{\alpha}$ with $\beta < \alpha$, the rule $\bar{\beta} \leftarrow \alpha, x$ guarantees that $\mathcal{F}'$ satisfies the Axiom of Weak Contraposition.) Similarly to Example 3, $\{\alpha\} <$ -defends $\{\varepsilon\}$, and $\mathcal{F}'$ has a unique $<$ -grounded/ $<$ -ideal/ $<$ -preferred/ $<$ -complete (but not $<$ -stable) extension $E' = \{p, q, \alpha, \varepsilon\}$ with $Cn'(E') = \{p, q, \alpha, \psi, y, \varepsilon\} \not\subseteq Cn(E)$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}$ does not fulfil STRICT CUT under any of the four semantics in question.

References

- [Čyras and Toni 2016a] Čyras, K., and Toni, F. 2016a. ABA^+ : Assumption-Based Argumentation with Preferences. *CoRR* abs/1610.0.
- [Čyras and Toni 2016b] Čyras, K., and Toni, F. 2016b. Properties of ABA^+ for Non-Monotonic Reasoning. In *16th International Workshop on Non-Monotonic Reasoning*, 25–34.